		Application No. Applicant(s)			
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	nn/	10/667,905		AZUMA ET AL.	
Examiner-initiated interview Summary		Examiner		Art Unit	· · · · <u>- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·</u>
		Christopher RoDee		1756	
All Participants:	Status of Application:				
(1) <u>Christopher RoDee</u> .		(3)			
(2) Mary Montebello, Reg # 33021.		(4)			
Date of Interview: 10 February 2006		Time:			
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	• •	nt's representative)			
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed: None					
Claims discussed: 1-6, 9					
Prior art documents discussed: None					
Part II.					
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE See Continuation Sheet	E GENEF	RAL NATURE OF WHA	AT WAS [DISCUSSED:	
Part III.					
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sedirectly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sedid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief 	tion. The eparate re	examiner will provide ecord of the substance	a written of the in	summary of the sterview, since the	substance
Robe					
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (A	pplicant/	Applicant's Representa	ative Sigr	nature – if approp	riate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted counsel to suggest an Examiner's Amendment to correct certain outstanding issues. For claims 2 and 9, these claims do not further limit claim 1 and the Examiner suggested that they be cancelled. For claims 3-6 the multiple dependency on claim 2 needs to be removed because of the cancelation of claim 2. For claim 6, the claim needs to refer to the electric charge transfering materials (i.e., plural) because two such materials are present in claim 1. Minor editorial changes to claim 1 were also suggested. Counsel agreed to the amendment.